



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/954,731

09/18/2001

Jeffrey J. Fitzgerald

CCI-004

7660

21323

7590

09/27/2006

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

PUENTE, EMERSON C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/954,731	Applicant(s) FITZGERALD, JEFFREY J.	
	Examiner Emerson C. Puente	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,11,13-19 and 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,11,13-19 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23,24, and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/10/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-19, and 23-26 have been examined.

This action is made **Final**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-11, 13-18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,831,512 of Nakai et al. referred hereinafter "Nakai" in view of US Patent No. 5,544,077 of Hershey.

In regards to claim 1, Nakai discloses:

generating an active message for processing by the active processor domain (see column 2 lines 40-45 and column 5 lines 19-23);

generating a modified active message by providing an active time indicator associated with the active message for each of the plurality of active processes (see column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23); and

generating a statistical characteristic for the modified active message (see column 6 lines 45-55);

However, Nakai fails to disclose:

Art Unit: 2113

generating a stand-by message for processing in a stand-by processor domain, the stand-by processor domain comprising a plurality of stand-by processes;

generating a modified stand-by message by providing a stand-by time indicator for at least one process of the plurality of stand-by processes in the stand-by domain.

based on the statistical characteristic, interchanging the stand-by processor domain with the active processor domain.

Hershey discloses a standby running the same program as the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45). Nakai disclose generating a message for processing in a processor domain, the processor domain comprising a plurality of processes (see column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23) and generating a modified message by providing a time indicator for at least one process of the plurality of processes in the domain (see column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23). If Nakai discloses a standby running the same program as the primary, as per teaching of Hershey, then Nakai in view of Hershey discloses generating a stand-by message for processing in a stand-by processor domain, the stand-by processor domain comprising a plurality of stand-by processes and generating a modified stand-by message by providing a stand-by time indicator for at least one process of the plurality of stand-by processes in the stand-by domain. Furthermore, Nakai discloses generating a statistical characteristic to determine an error (see column 6 lines 45-55) and Hershey discloses wherein if the standby senses the primary failing, the standby is switchover to perform the functions of the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45), thus indicating based on the statistical characteristic, interchanging the stand-by processor domain with the active processor domain.

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nakai to have a standby running the same programs as the primary or active, wherein if the standby senses the primary failing, the standby is switchover to perform the functions of the primary. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated because Nakai discloses detecting errors or fault (see column 6 lines 20-30), and having a standby, as per teachings of Hershey, allows for continued processing in the event of failure of the primary or active (see column 2 lines 40-45).

In regards to claim 2, Nakai discloses:

the step of determining a status of the active processor domain in response to the active time indicator (see column 6 lines 20-58).

In regards to claim 3, Nakai discloses:

wherein a respective active time indicator is associated with each process of the plurality of processes, and wherein the step of determining the status of the active processor domain is responsive to more than one of the active time indicators (see column 4 lines 1-8 and column 6 lines 20-58).

In regards to claim 4, Nakai discloses:

wherein the active time indicator comprises a time-stamp indicating the time the at least one process completed processing the active message (see column 4 lines 35-40).

In regards to claim 5, Nakai discloses:

wherein the active time indicator comprises a time-stamp indicating the time elapsed while the at least one process processed the active message (see column 6 lines 34-40).

In regards to claim 7, Nakai discloses:

Art Unit: 2113

wherein the step of determining the statistical characteristic comprises generating a time average of the duration of the at least one process of the plurality of processes for a plurality of active messages (see column 6 lines 45-55).

In regards to claim 10, Hershey discloses a standby that runs the same programs as the primary or active (see column 2 lines 30-45). Since Nakai discloses determining the status of the active processor domain is responsive to the active time indicator, Nakai in view of Hershey discloses determining the status of the stand-by processor domain is responsive to the stand-by time indicator.

In regards to claim 11, Hershey discloses a standby that runs the same programs as the primary or active (see column 2 lines 30-45). Since Nakai discloses wherein a respective active time indicator is associated with each process of the plurality of processes, and wherein the step of determining the status of the active processor domain is responsive to at least two of the active time indicators (see column 4 lines 1-8 and column 6 lines 20-30), Nakai in view of Hershey discloses a respective stand-by time indicator is associated with each process of the plurality of stand-by processes of the stand-by domain and the step of determining the status of the stand-by processor domain is responsive to at least two of the stand-by time indicators.

In regards to claim 13, Nakai discloses:

an active processor domain, the active processor domain having at least one active processor, the at least one active processor executing at least one active process, the at least one active process receiving an active message and generating a modified active message in response thereto (see figure 2 and column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23);

Art Unit: 2113

an active time-stamp mechanism in communication with the at least one active process and for providing an active time indicator for each of the at least one active processor for use in generation of the modified active message (see column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23);

However, Nakai fails to disclose:

a stand-by processor domain, the stand-by processor domain having at least one processor, the at least one processor executing at least one stand-by process, the at least one stand-by process receiving a stand-by message and generating a modified stand-by message in response thereto,

a stand-by time-stamp mechanism in communication with the at least one stand-by process and for providing a stand-by time indicator for use in generation of the modified stand-by message.

a redundancy manager in communication with the active processor domain and the stand-by processor domain, the redundancy manager interchanging, based on a statistical characteristic for the modified active message, the active processor domain with the stand-by processor domain

Hershey discloses a standby running the same program as the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45). Nakai disclose a processor domain, the processor domain having at least one processor, the at least one processor executing at least one process, the at least one process receiving a message and generating a modified message in response thereto (see figure 2 and column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23) and a time-stamp mechanism in communication with the at least one process and for providing a time indicator for use in generation of the modified message (see column 2 lines 63-66 and column 5 lines 19-23). If Nakai discloses a standby

Art Unit: 2113

running the same program as the primary, as per teaching of Hershey, Nakai in view of Hershey discloses a stand-by processor domain, the stand-by processor domain having at least one processor, the at least one processor executing at least one stand-by process, the at least one stand-by process receiving a stand-by message and generating a modified stand-by message in response thereto and a stand-by time-stamp mechanism in communication with the at least one stand-by process and for providing a stand-by time indicator for use in generation of the modified stand-by message. Furthermore, Nakai discloses generating a statistical characteristic to determine an error (see column 6 lines 45-55) and Hershey discloses wherein if the standby senses the primary failing, the standby is switchover to perform the functions of the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45), thus indicating a redundancy manager in communication with the active processor domain and the stand-by processor domain, the redundancy manager interchanging, based on a statistical characteristic for the modified active message, the active processor domain with the stand-by processor domain.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Nakai to have a standby running the same programs as the primary or active, wherein if the standby senses the primary failing, the standby is switchover to perform the functions of the primary. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated because Nakai discloses detecting errors or fault (see column 6 lines 20-30), and having a standby, as per teachings of Hershey, allows for continued processing in the event of failure of the primary or active (see column 2 lines 40-45).

In regards to claim 14, Nakai discloses:

Art Unit: 2113

wherein the redundancy manager determines a status of the active processor domain in response to the active time indicator (see column 6 lines 20-58).

In regards to claim 15, Nakai discloses

wherein the active time indicator comprises a time-stamp indicating a time at which the at least one process completes processing the active message (see column 4 lines 35-40).

In regards to claim 16, Nakai discloses

wherein the active time indicator comprises a time-stamp indicating the time elapsed while the at least one active processor processes the active message (see column 6 lines 34-40)

In regards to claim 17, Nakai discloses

wherein the redundancy manager determines the status of the active processor domain in response to the statistical characteristic (see column 6 lines 45-55).

In regards to claim 18, Nakai discloses

wherein the statistical characteristic comprises a time average of the duration of the at least one active process (see column 6 lines 45-55).

In regards to claim 25, Nakai discloses

comparing the statistical characteristic to a predetermined threshold value (see column 6 lines 45-55).

Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakai in view of Hershey and in further view of US Patent No. 6,073,089 of Baker et al. referred hereinafter "Baker".

In regards to claim 8, Nakai in view of Hershey fails to explicitly disclose:

Art Unit: 2113

wherein the statistical characteristic comprise a standard deviation from the time average.

Baker discloses using standard deviation to detect faults or errors (see column 4 lines 15-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the statistical characteristic comprises a standard deviation from the time average. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated because Nakai discloses determining an error or fault (see column 6 lines 20-30), and standard deviation, as per teaching of Baker, is known and used method to indicate an error or fault (see column 4 lines 15-33).

In regards to claim 19, Nakai in view of Hershey fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the statistical characteristic comprise a standard deviation of the duration of the at least one active process.

Baker discloses using standard deviation to detect faults or errors (see column 4 lines 15-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the statistical characteristic comprises a standard deviation from the time average. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated because Nakai discloses determining an error or fault (see column 6 lines 20-30), and standard deviation, as per teaching of Baker, is known and used method to indicate an error or fault (see column 4 lines 15-33).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23, 24, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument to rejection of Claim 1 under 103 on bottom of page 6 which cites "Nakai discloses a plurality of processors (see column 5, line 16) and processes ("programs", see column 5, line 17). Therefore, Nakai would have to provide time stamps for each of the plurality of processors or processes to teach or suggest the limitation in claim 1 noted above. However, Nakai discloses adding only one time stamp ("TS 1" see column 5, lines 24-36) for each message. Nakai teaches eliminating message redundancy based on the single time stamp in each message. Nakai does not teach or suggest "... providing an active time indicator ... for each of the plurality of active processes ..." Furthermore, nowhere in Hershey is there any teaching or suggestion for modifying an active message by providing an active time indicator. Therefore, Applicant submits that Nakai and Hershey, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the elements of the claimed invention," and applicant's argument to rejection of Claim 13 under 103 on page 10 which cites "As noted earlier, neither Nakai nor Hershey teach or suggest providing an active time indicator for each of the at least one active processor," examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2113

Nakai discloses a plurality of processors that have application programs stored therein that executes processes (see column 5 lines 15-18 and 25-26), indicating a plurality of active processes. Nakai further discloses processor 11 generating a message adding a timestamp TS, indicating an active time indicator, to the data (see column 5 lines 19-23). This modified message is received by processors 12 and 13, whose programs execute processes that creates a modified message including timestamp TS1 (see column 5 lines 24-34). As each process creates a modified messages including a timestamp or active time indicator, Nakia discloses generating a modified active message by providing an active time indicator for each of the plurality of active processes. Argument is moot. Examiner maintains his rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (see page 7-9 of Remarks), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Nakai discloses detecting errors or fault (see column 6 lines 20-30), and having a standby, as per teachings of Hershey, allows for continued processing in the event of failure of the primary or active (see column 2 lines 40-45).

In response to applicant's argument to rejection of Claim 13 under 103 on page 10 which cites "Nakai does not teach any stand-by processor and also teaches away from redundant

Art Unit: 2113

messages, Consequently, Nakai does not teach or suggest any redundancy manager capable of interchanging the active processor domain with the standby-processor domain. Additionally, Hershey does not teach a redundancy manager and therefore fails to fill the gap,” examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hershey discloses a standby running the same program as the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45). Hershey also discloses if the standby senses an error in the primary, the standby is switchover to perform the functions of the primary (see column 2 lines 30-45), thus indicating a redundancy manager capable of interchanging the stand-by processor domain with the active processor domain. Argument is moot. Examiner maintains his rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2113

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C. Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ecp
8/30/06

Robert W. Beausoliel
ROBERT W. BEAUSOLIEL
Supervisor
Art Unit 2113
Patent and Trademark Office
U.S. Department of Commerce